



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/114,962    07/14/98    BREED

D    AJI-192

022846  
BRIAN ROFFE, ESQ  
366 LONGACRE AVENUE  
WOODMERE NY 11598

PM82/0102

EXAMINER

CULBRETH, E

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3611

DATE MAILED:

01/02/01

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/114,962

Applicant(s)

Breed et al

Examiner

Eric Culbreth

Group Art Unit

3611



THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

- ☐ Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on \_\_\_\_\_ (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).

Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on Dec 18, 1900 has been considered with the following effect, but is NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

☒ The proposed amendment(s):

☐ will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.

☒ will not be entered because:

- ☒ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
- ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
- ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
- ☐ they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: The amended claims require further consideration because they are not in proper form (underlined additions, bracketed deletions). Although there are marked up copies of the claims in the Appendix, (see Other below)

- ☐ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):

- ☐ Newly proposed or amended claims \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

as applicant notes (page 9, first paragraph of the remarks) claim 1 does not mention that the crash sensor is placed in a crush zone as is argued; hence the combination meets the claims. Other applied art meets the claims (see final

- ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):

Claims allowed: \_\_\_\_\_

Claims objected to: 8, 15, 20, and 25

Claims rejected: 1-7, 9-14, 16-19, 21-24, and 26-31

- ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.

- ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

☒ Other the claims to be entered would still have to be compared to the claims in the Appendix for accuracy, which would require further consideration, as opposed to if the claims to be entered were properly amended.

*Eric Culbreth*  
ERIC CULBRETH  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
12/30/00